REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered the July 20, 2007 Office Action, and the amendments above together with the comments that follow are presented in a bona fide effort to address all issues raised in that Action and thereby place this case in condition for allowance. Claims 1-13 were pending in this application, of which claims 12 and 13 were withdrawn form consideration pursuant to the previous restriction requirement. In response to the Office Action dated July 20, 2007, claims 1-11 have been amended. Adequate descriptive support for the present Amendment should be apparent throughout the originally filed disclosure as, for example, the depicted embodiments and related discussion thereof in the written description of the specification. Applicants submit that the present Amendment does not generate any new matter issue. Entry of the present Amendment is respectfully solicited. It is believed that this response places this case in condition for allowance. Hence, prompt favorable reconsideration of this case is solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to expressly consider the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on August 24, 2004 and make of record all of the references cited on the PTO-1449. The Examiner line through the second non-patent literature citation on the PTO-1449 form and indicated that an incomplete date was provided. However, Applicant submits that Applicant listed the publication year as printed on the reference and that the publication year is the only date provided on the reference. Thus, the Examiner is requested to forward a properly initialed copy of the PTO-1449 with the next Office action.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the foregoing amendments to claims 1-11 to address the issues raised by the Examiner at pages 7-8 of the Office

action. One having ordinary skill in the art would not have difficulty understanding the scope of the presently claimed invention, particularly when reasonably interpreted in light of the supporting specification. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the imposed rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is not legally viable and hence, Applicant solicits withdrawal thereof.

Claims 1 and 4-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over Hasegawa et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2001/0038740, hereinafter "Hasegawa").

The factual determination of lack of novelty under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the identical disclosure in a single reference of each element of a claimed invention, such that the identically claimed invention is placed into the possession of one having ordinary skill in the art. *Helifix Ltd. v. Blok-Lok, Ltd.*, 208 F.3d 1339, 54 USPQ2d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Electro Medical Systems S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences, Inc.*, 34 F.3d 1048, 32 USPQ2d 1017 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Moreover, in imposing the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Examiner is required to specifically identify wherein an applied reference is perceived to identically disclose each feature of a claimed invention. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 USPQ2d 1955 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

As admitted by the Examiner at page 6, Hasegawa does not teach the claimed tension value of 0.78 N or more, as explicitly required by independent claim 1, as amended. Thus, the imposed rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for lack of novelty as evidenced by Hasegawa is not factually viable and, hence, solicit withdrawal thereof.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa alone, or in view of Harvey et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,284,499, hereinafter "Harvey"). Applicant traverses.

Applicant incorporates herein the argument previously advanced in traversal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) predicated upon Hasegawa. The secondary reference to Harvey does not cure the argued deficiencies of Hasegawa. It should be stressed that Harvey teaches a drawing step for a solid fiber and, therefore, the drawing tension value disclosed by Harvey is not applicable to the fiber of Hasegawa. Moreover with respect to the Examiner's conclusion that the claimed tension value is an art recognized result-effective variable, the Examiner must go beyond establishing that varying the limitation produces some random result. A random result is not enough; instead, the result must be desirable and worth modifying to one having ordinary skill in the art. Thus, the rejection is not legally viable for at least these reasons.

If any independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

It is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Brian K. Seidleck
Registration No. 51,321

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 BKS:idw
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: October 22, 2007

Please recognize our Customer No. 20277 as our correspondence address.